

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/722,362	LUNT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satwant Singh	2626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Satwant Singh. (3) Scott Schulte.
 (2) Kimberly A. Williams. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3/15/05.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 14.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stefik (US 6233684).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Schulte emphasized that in the present invention, a server (or program) determines the policy and determines the protection level, wherein Stefik teaches that the user sets the protection level. The examiner emphasized that the language of claim 1 does not prevent the use of Stefik and further the claims would more distinguish from the Stefik if the policy were more defined. Some proposed language was discussed to include the limitation that the contents of the document would be considered. This appears to read over Stefik. Upon filing an amendment after final, further consideration and/or search would be needed .